

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1-3 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over the patent to Ludwig.

After carefully considering the Examiner's grounds for the rejection of the claims over the art, applicant amended claim 1, the broadest claim on file, to more clearly define the present invention and to distinguish it from the prior art.

Claim 8, the broadest method claim, has been amended to make it independent.

Finally, two additional dependent claims 12 and 13 have been submitted, which depend on claim 1.

Claim 1, the broadest claim on file, has been amended to define, in addition to the other features, that the stator 1 is provided on its face ends with opening 22, 28, 29 for receiving the bearing rings 2, and the openings 20, 22, 29 are configured as annular grooves extending in a circumferential direction.

This feature is specifically disclosed in lines 11 and 12 on page 5 of the specification.

Turning now to the prior art applied by the Examiner, and in particular to the patent to Ludwig, it can be seen that in the electrical motor disclosed in the patent to Ludwig, the bearing-supporting brackets 11 are inserted directly into the stator opening for the rotor. Therefore, the throughgoing inner diameter in the region of the bearing-supporting brackets 11 is reduced, so that the rotor at this axial locations must have a correspondingly reduced diameter. This is carried out in the patent to Ludwig by the flattening of the rotor member 6 and the windings 8.

The patent to Ludwig however does not provide any hint or suggestion that additional openings or grooves 20, 28, 29 can be formed on the end sides of the stator, in addition to the stator opening for the rotor. This reference does not contain any hint or suggestion for the person of ordinary skill to configure such additional openings 20, 28, 29 as annular grooves at the end sides of the stator.

The original claims were rejected over this reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated. It is believed to be advisable to cite the

decision in re Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) in which it was stated:

"Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim."

Definitely, the patent to Ludwig does not disclose each and every element which is now defined in claim 1, the broadest claim on file, and therefore the anticipation rejection should be considered as not tenable and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 8, the broadest claim on file, defines that the method for assembling of an electrical machine in which the countersunk features 20, 28, 29 on the stator 1 are embodied when the winding lamination packet are created in the stator, during the stamping process of the laminations, in the face ends of the stator.


These features of the present invention as defined in claim 8 are also not disclosed in the patent to Ludwig. The patent to Ludwig does not disclose either the forming of the additional openings, or the inventive manufacturing process as defined in claim 8. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 8 should also be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

Claims 12 and 13, define additional new features of the present invention which are not disclosed in the patent to Ludwig. These claims, together with claim 3 which depend on claim 1, and claim 9 which depends on claim 8, should also be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233